



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

The  
**American Historical Review**

THE MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION AT DETROIT AND ANN ARBOR

THE sixteenth annual meeting of the American Historical Association was held on December 27, 28 and 29, the middle day being devoted to sessions at Ann Arbor, the rest of the time spent at Detroit. Perhaps no meeting has ever been so successful in the general promotion of mutual acquaintance. To a larger extent than usual the members were gathered under one roof. Nearly all the sessions were held under that same roof, the hotel having an adequate convention hall. Detroit itself, though handsome and attractive, and abundantly hospitable, did not present, to savants who being human are prone to wander, those distractions which are presented by larger cities; perhaps, indeed, a city of the second size, with a university near by, affords the best place for meetings of such an association. However this may be, certain it is that a large number of members were present, and found much pleasure in social intercourse with their fellow-members and with the members of the American Economic Association, which met at the same time and place, though with another hotel as its headquarters. It was noticeable that a large number of young men were present, whose obvious interest and serious devotion to their professional work were constantly gratifying. General and Mrs. Russell A. Alger received the members, with cordial hospitality, on the Thursday afternoon; "smokers" were given by the University Club and the Detroit Club in the evenings; and the ladies attending were entertained by Mrs. George O. Robinson. By the kindness of citizens of Michigan, a special train was provided which conveyed the members to and from Ann Arbor, where they were hospitably entertained to luncheon by President Angell and other members of the faculty of the University of Michigan. The university provided rooms for the sessions of Friday. That of Thursday evening, at which

the presiding officers of the two associations read their addresses, was held in the First Methodist Church of Detroit. That all the arrangements were carried out so smoothly, and resulted in so much pleasure to those who attended, is due to the faithful preparatory work of the local committee of arrangements, and primarily to its chairman, Professor Earle W. Dow, of the University of Michigan. It is more proper to record the obligations of the Association to him because he was not seen at any of the sessions, owing to illness largely caused by his devotion to this very task. For the skillful construction of the programme, composed of elements unusually varied yet so associated as to avoid all appearance of scrappiness, the Association is mainly indebted to the chairman of its committee on the programme, Professor Andrew C. McLaughlin of the same university, who was assisted in this work by Professors Robinson, Turner, E. G. Bourne and Judson, and Mr. A. Howard Clark.

The great success of the meeting was the more remarkable when it is remembered how many were ill of those upon whom the Association and the committee had relied as officers and speakers. The President, Dr. Edward Eggleston, was unexpectedly prevented by illness from appearing; and the Second Vice-President was then unable to take his place. The First Vice-President, Professor Moses Coit Tyler, died at Ithaca during the time of the sessions. Expressions of sorrow over his loss were frequent and genuine. Much of the best of his work had been done at Ann Arbor. He was one of the founders of the Association, one of its chief ornaments, and one who worthily filled the place of an elder brother in a profession still young in our country. Many of the members of the Association had had occasion to appreciate not only his learning, the grace of his style and the charm of his conversation, but his personal tact and friendly courtesy, and the kindness and warmth of his heart. Continued ill-health caused the resignation, at this meeting, of Professor Herbert B. Adams of Baltimore, Secretary of the Association from the time of its foundation in 1884. He had had a most important, and indeed probably the leading share in its organization, and had borne the principal part in the arrangement of its first eleven meetings. His constant and devoted services to the Association were gratefully noted in private, and publicly commemorated by a formal minute of the Association and by his election to the office of First Vice-President. Illness prevented two or three of the speakers from appearing, though in one case the paper was read by a friend. The duty of presiding was acceptably performed by two ex-presidents, Dr. James Ford

Rhodes and President James B. Angell of the University, and by Hon. Peter White, a member of the Council.

Aside from the business meeting, there were six sessions of the Association. One of these was devoted to the inaugural addresses ; one was a joint session held with the American Economic Association. Of the remaining four, one was given to the history of the Crusades and of the East, one to the Church History Section, one to Western history, and one was divided between British history and that of the United States.

In the session devoted to the Crusades and the East, the first paper was one which Professor George L. Burr of Cornell University had been requested to prepare, on the Year One Thousand and the Antecedents of the First Crusade, in general review of the modern discussions and the present state of knowledge. This paper appears as the next article to this, in the present number of this REVIEW. After it, Professor Oliver J. Thatcher of the University of Chicago read a carefully prepared and instructive survey of the modern Critical Work on the Sources for the First Crusade. Beginning with Ranke's seminary of 1837 and Sybel's book of 1841, he traced the history of the discussion, and described the Latin sources of the first rank—the letters of the crusaders and the eye-witness accounts by the anonymous Italian, Raymond of Agiles, Fulcher of Chartres, and Tudebod—and those of the second rank, coming from writers who, like Ekkehard and Radulf, went out to the Holy Land soon after the date of this crusade. He then gave a brief account of the ways in which the modern process of shifting emphasis from the secondary to the primary sources has reconstituted our narrative of the First Crusade—the relegating of Peter the Hermit to the background, the exalting of Pope Urban, the partial discrediting of the leaders—and of the causes which had brought about the original distortion.

President Angell of the University of Michigan, formerly ambassador to Turkey, read the paper upon the Capitulations in Turkey which appeared in our last issue (pp. 254–259). In discussion of Dr. Thatcher's paper, Professor Archibald C. Coolidge of Harvard University dwelt especially upon the important relations of the Crusades to the Eastern Church and Empire and to Asiatic history in general, and upon the Byzantine sources for their history. Dr. Alfred L. P. Dennis, instructor at Harvard, by request described, both with respect to the Crusades and in more general aspects, the Oriental portion of the library of the late Count Riant. This half of his collections has been presented to the library of Harvard University, while the Scandinavian section has been presented to Yale.

The morning session ended with the appointment of the following committees by the chair: on finance, Hon. Elbridge T. Gerry and Mr. George S. Bowdoin; on audit, Messrs. Bryant Walker and Andrew McF. Davis; on nominations, Professors H. P. Judson, George L. Burr and Victor Coffin; on resolutions, Hon. Simeon E. Baldwin, Professor James A. Woodburn and Professor John M. Vincent.

The public session of the Church History Section, presided over by its secretary, Rev. Dr. Samuel Macauley Jackson, was well attended. The first paper was by Professor George James Bayles, of Columbia University, and was entitled *American Ecclesiology*. His subject was not ecclesiology in the narrower sense of architectural antiquities, but in general that branch of social history which has to do with religion in America. The chief data were: a limited individual action for the purposes of religion, a limited co-operative action for the same, and a limited creation of corporation law. Throughout our history there had been an enlargement of the scope of individual and voluntary action in religion. Secondly, it seemed probable that the era of differentiation was coming to a close, and an era of absorption, consolidation and concentration opening. There had been a great growth of auxiliary organizations, with specialized functions; and many new forms of association had been evolved, such as federations of churches and other groupings. In the third respect, differentiating the concepts of the church, religious society, parish, and civil incorporation, he showed how the religious society, first, had been created by the civil power, and how, after the Revolution, great efforts were made to devise a good method whereby any religious body could receive incorporation. At the present time many laws recognize the organization and functionaries of churches, and give them authorization; while in some states there has been a tendency, likely to increase, toward the creation of corporations sole.

Professor Francis A. Christie of Meadville Theological Seminary, read an elaborate paper on the Date of the Ignatian Epistles. The date most often assigned to them has been about 110 A. D. The external (Eusebian) authority on which this date was grounded being regarded by the essayist as baseless, internal evidence must be relied on. He argued for a date during the reign of Hadrian. The chief heresy attacked in the epistles is the Doketic denial of the flesh of Christ and the consequent withdrawal from the Eucharist as celebrated by the parish bishop. The letters were demonstrably written before the Gnostic speculations were combated by means of the Logos doctrine, but at a time when Doketic

conceptions of Christ were becoming known in the churches of Syria and Asia Minor. Such views seem not to have been known in those regions until the appearance of Saturninus, Cerdon and Marcion, who cannot have been active before A. D. 130. Yet on the other hand the letters appear to have been written before Marcion's literary activity began.

The last paper, on the Origin of the Apostles' Creed, by Professor Arthur C. McGiffert of Union Theological Seminary, was in his absence read by Dr. Jackson. The writer found no earlier occurrence of the Apostles' Creed than in Gaul and Spain in the sixth century, but dealt with the origin of the old Roman Symbol from which it was derived, and which may be traced to the latter part of the second century. Some have thought that it was known in Rome when Marcion came, and to Justin, but Dr. McGiffert saw no evidence of its existence before Irenaeus, and dated it at about 150-175 A. D. Devised as a baptismal confession, and as necessary for protection against heresy, it bears evidence of its time in the nature of the errors, Doketic and Gnostic, against which its phrases are manifestly directed. Much of the paper was given to an analysis of these phrases, conducted from this point of view.

The evening session, as has already been mentioned, was given, after an address of welcome by Mayor Maybury of Detroit, to the inaugural address of Professor Richard T. Ely, President of the American Economic Association, and to a similar address by Dr. James Ford Rhodes, substituted for that which had been expected from Dr. Edward Eggleston as President of the American Historical Association. Dr. Ely chose as his subject "Competition, its Nature, Permanency and Beneficence." He dwelt on the development of competition through successive stages of economic life, pointing out how, originally cruel, it had constantly risen in plane during the progress of social evolution, so that slaughter, slavery, child-labor, and many unwholesome and oppressive practices once inseparable from competition had been successively ruled out. He dwelt also upon the thought that social evolution among men brought into being, along with competition, the growing enlargement of the associated competitive group; and the larger the competitive group, the greater the scope of sympathy, benevolence and public authority. Through the selective process of competition, a permanent element of human society, we have the survival of the fit; but it is for society to create such economic conditions that only desirable social qualities shall constitute eminent fitness for survival. The beneficence of the competitive order depends on the reconciliation of the effort to secure equality of opportunity to individuals and the maintenance

and development of those great economic institutions, such as private property and inheritance, which, though they limit competition, are justly regarded as among the principal achievements and possessions of our race.

Mr. Rhodes spoke upon the Writing of History. One should make sure of having, either in respect to manner or in respect to facts, something new to say. Historical originality may lie, to mention one particular, in the employment of some class of sources open to everyone but not heretofore used. A significant case of this in American history is the use which Dr. von Holst made of newspaper material. In the years just before the Civil War facts are to be found in the newspapers which were nowhere else set down. Dr. von Holst had appreciated this, had read them extensively, and used them with pertinence and effect, where previous writers had been prone to avoid them because of their inaccuracy and their mass. After touching upon the larger questions of style and of the mastery of facts, Mr. Rhodes discussed the subject of footnotes. Admitting that a mass of them was cumbrous and distracted the average reader from the narrative, he dwelt upon the profit which the historian derived from being held, or holding himself, to a strict responsibility for his statements through the necessity of supporting them by exact references. Their use was especially valuable in keeping the writer from hasty or strained or imperfect generalizations. Finally, the qualities of some of the great ancient and modern historians were passed in review, with several interesting suggestions as to methods of preparation and composition.

At Ann Arbor, on Friday morning, President Angell opened the joint session of the two associations with an address of welcome marked by his usual felicity. The first paper, by Professor Paul S. Reinsch of the University of Wisconsin, on French Experiments with Political Assimilation in the West Indies, is that which we are so fortunate as to be permitted to present in this number of the REVIEW. In Dr. Reinsch's absence it was read by his colleague, Professor Haskins. Professor H. Morse Stephens of Cornell University then spoke informally on the Turning Points in the History of British Administration in India. He first described the situation in the period between the virtual cession of Bengal and the arrival of Warren Hastings, during which the Company and the government of Great Britain alike refused to recognize responsibility for administration. Hastings resolved, as far as was possible, to put the Company into the position which had been occupied by the Emperor in respect to the administration of the

imperial provinces; and from 1772 to 1828 the general system was one which recognized the native practices and declined to interfere with them. The years from 1828 to 1857, from Lord William Bentinck to the Mutiny, were marked by a definite and conscious tendency, on the part of the paramount power, to introduce regulations conceived from the point of view of England, for instance by the abolition of suttee and thuggee, the introduction of the official use of the English language, and Lord Dalhousie's policy of annexation. The result was disaffection, shown at the time of the Mutiny. From 1858 to 1872 was a period of reconstruction, marked by great increase of efficiency. Native rights were more respected, and the integrity of the native states conserved. At the same time there was much administrative centralization. The period since Lord Mayo's rule, 1872-1900, has been marked by administrative decentralization and especially the completer organization of the eight great provinces. The main lesson of Indian history is the necessity of studying the subject populations as they actually are.

Dr. J. H. Hollander, the Treasurer of Porto Rico, who was to have discoursed upon the finances of the island, was unable to be present. Professor John H. Finley of Princeton, upon the basis of a recent and extensive walking-tour, described the general conditions of Porto Rico, and discussed the resulting financial difficulties which Dr. Hollander had encountered. He also discussed the code which the first commission had provided, and the better plans of the new commission. He believed that projects of administrative reform should begin with the municipalities, and that a form of general government more nearly approaching that of our territories might well be substituted for that which has lately been established.

In the discussion which followed, Professor Henry E. Bourne, of Western Reserve University, emphasized the local quality in our colonial problems. It was possible to study the Porto Rican problem with relation either to our institutions, or to the origin of the Porto Rico bill, or to the Philippine question; or to study the problems of each of our colonies with reference to local conditions and the experience of European nations. Professor Charles H. Hull of Cornell University set forth with great clearness the fiscal system of Porto Rico as it existed in the year 1897-1898, the effects which were necessarily involved in the transfer of sovereignty, those which actually resulted, and the plans made necessary for the future.

In the afternoon, at the session devoted to Western history, Professor Edward G. Bourne of Yale University read portions of that paper on the Legend of Marcus Whitman, which we had the



pleasure of printing in our January issue. He illustrated the vogue of the legend in an amusing way by showing that, in the recent voting for the Hall of Fame, Whitman received more votes than Senator Benton, Chief-Justice Chase or General Scott, and the same number as President Monroe. Then Mr. William I. Marshall of Chicago assailed the legend with much warmth, declaring that he had contended against it ever since 1888. He asserted that it first appeared in the *Pacific*, the organ of the California Congregationalists, in the issue for November 9, 1865, in an article by Rev. Mr. Spalding. He also made quotations from letters of Whitman and his wife, written during the year between the arrival of the Canadian immigrants and the beginning of his famous ride, and tending to show the motives for the latter. Mr. Marshall described his determined efforts to procure the elimination of the Whitman story from school text-books of history, even going so far as to read private letters received from the writers of such books. He was followed by Mr. Ripley Hitchcock of New York, who admitted that he had originally countenanced the story, but on examination was forced to give it up as Dr. Elliott Coues had also felt obliged to do. Mr. Hitchcock gave great credit to Mrs. Victor for her pioneer investigation, and concluded by pointing out some elements of the situation, in the Northwest and in American diplomacy, inconsistent with the legend.

The second of these papers in Western history was by Professor Samuel B. Harding of Indiana State University, and related to the Party Struggles in Missouri from 1861 to 1865. He described the contest of 1861 over the question of union or disunion, the varieties of party opinion then existing, the struggle of the unconditional-Union men against Governor Jackson, the actions of the convention, and the course of Captain Lyon, which, however effective in a military sense, he declared to have been politically a mistake. From the death of Lyon and the establishment of martial law, the opposition to secession passed into the hands of the military. The writer then turned to the other contest, that respecting slavery, and traced it from Gratz Brown's speech of 1858, but especially from 1861, through the period of radical supremacy made evident in the convention of 1863, and so to the convention of 1865 which abolished slavery. A new period then began, because of the disfranchising clause and the disabilities inherited from the Civil War. The narrative was continued to the election of Gratz Brown in 1870 and the end of the sway of the radicals.

Professor Frank H. Hodder of the University of Kansas then read a paper on An Omitted Chapter in the History of the Second

Missouri Compromise. The resolution of March 2, 1821, for the admission of Missouri, provides "that the fourth clause of the twenty-sixth section of the third article of the constitution" of Missouri shall never be so construed as to permit the passing of an act depriving citizens of other states of any of their privileges under the Federal Constitution. Now the clause against which the opponents of slavery were contending, and against which this phrase of the resolution has been assumed to have been directed, is not the one thus numerically designated. Art. III., Sec. 26, consists of three unnumbered portions, the first prohibitory upon the legislature, and consisting of two clauses, the second permissive, in four clauses, the third mandatory, in two clauses. It is the first clause of this third portion that enjoins the general assembly to pass a law to prevent the immigration of free negroes. Eustis's resolution provided that "the clause forbidding free negroes" to enter the state should be withdrawn. The misleading designation first appears in a resolution offered in the House by S. Moore of Pennsylvania on February 2. Mr. Hodder traced its history through the contest over Clay's and Roberts's resolutions and Clay's joint committee to the final vote, in which the existing form was carried by a change of votes on the part of More and two other Pennsylvanian members and one from North Carolina. He expressed suspicions of deliberate misdescription, and made some effort to trace it to its source. The session was closed by remarks by Professor Macy of Iowa College, on the relations of Western history to general history, and on the points of comparison between westward migration in the Old World and that from the Old World to the New and to the West.

The last of the sessions devoted to papers, that of Saturday morning, was marked by one informal address in English history and one in the most recent period of American history, with ensuing discussion. Illness detained the other speakers. Professor Wilbur C. Abbott of Dartmouth described the results of an investigation into the history of the opposition in Parliament during the time of the American War, and especially in the Parliament of 1774-1780. At first the opposition usually numbered only forty or fifty. By the beginning of 1776 it had increased to eighty or ninety. While the surrender of Burgoyne had no effect upon it, the news of the French alliance immediately added forty or fifty members. Speaking generally, it was not till this time that the country gentlemen began to go over. From this point the opposition steadily increased till Dunning's motion was carried. Dr. Abbott described the nature of the ministerial party and its resulting liability to sudden collapse, the influence of army officers discredited by the government be-

cause of defeat, the small effects of the accession of Fox. He concluded that the American War had less influence on Parliament than was commonly supposed ; and that enlistments were not so difficult, nor the war so generally unpopular, as has been thought.

Professor Dunning of Columbia University then spoke on the Undoing of Reconstruction. Contrasting the abundant possession of political power by the negroes in 1870, when reconstruction was complete, with their present exclusion from the exercise of political rights, he characterized the three chief periods of the process through which this has come about. The first period, which had already begun during the years of reconstruction, and was complete by 1877, was marked by the ejection of the blacks from the governments of the Southern states especially through the " Mississippi plan " of systematic intimidation. The second, 1877-1890, during which the balance of national political parties made partisan Federal legislation impossible, while the judiciary rejected the Civil Rights Acts, was the period of fraud as distinguished from force. The last decade had been marked by open assertion of the necessity of repression and of white rule, and by systematic endeavors, through constitutional revision, to legalize what had before been done illegally. Professor Dunning dwelt on the thoughts, that the problem of the co-existence of the two races in the United States could not be settled by the mere abolition of slavery ; and that the undoing of reconstruction had shown that it could not be settled on the basis of equality.

In the discussion which ensued, Professor Hart of Harvard, alluding to the various aspects under which the subject might be discussed, confined himself to the question how far success had been attained in the great endeavor to abolish the distinction of color in legal relations. He touched upon the abolition of slavery, the extent to which there was equality before the courts, the exclusion from the franchise, and the failure to secure social equality. Mr. Percy N. Booth of Louisville spoke of the drift of the Southern negroes into the black states, from the highlands into the lowlands, and away from the villages,—the apparent tendency toward isolation of the races. Dr. Theodore Clarke Smith discussed the question, what the Republican leaders of the reconstruction movement expected. He showed that most were uncertain ; that Stevens's aim was to secure party supremacy and the results of the war ; that Sumner, Wilson and Greeley, filled with the spirit of the liberalism of their generation, had no doubts. The negro was a man, therefore give him a vote. He was a man, therefore he would use it well. Stevens and many others thought that there would be

enough Southern white Republicans to control him. Others, with some doubting, thought that he would soon learn. Others expected that his vote would always be so valuable to either side that he would be courted by both. Others thought that he would maintain his newly conferred rights only so long as supported by force. All predictions proved wrong except these last. The reasons why the Republicans had acquiesced in the recent situation were, first, that they had concluded that the dangers apprehended by Stevens were imaginary ; secondly, because of the decay of the old-fashioned liberalism, of the belief in equal rights and abstract rights generally, and the substitution of an evolutionary philanthropy for that based on the earlier doctrines.

With this ended the sessions devoted to papers. If any general criticism were to be ventured, it would be that too many of the writers ignored that wholesome rule of the Association, printed conspicuously upon the programme, which limited papers to twenty minutes, and discussions to ten minutes for each speaker. Deliberately to prepare and read a paper forty minutes long is an act without excuse ; nor can much be said in defense of "brief remarks" extending to fifteen or twenty minutes. The kindly gentlemen who presided, not being presidents, were evidently reluctant, clothed in a little brief authority, to apply the *clôture* ; but many hearers would fain have seen them truculent and remorseless. Another evil, deserving correction in future meetings, is the substitution, for fresh and real discussion of the longer papers, of cut-and-dried short papers. The "liberty of prophesying" which prevailed in the earlier meetings of the Association had its evils ; but a Rhadamanthine president can avert them.

At noon the two associations partook together of a subscription luncheon at the Russell House. President Angell, to everyone's enjoyment, acted as toastmaster, and talked entertainingly of the growth of the historical and economic professions since the time when he was at college. Mr. Henry Russel, attorney of the Michigan Central Railroad, read in honor of Hon. Peter White a humorous dialect poem entitled "Pierre Le Blanc." Professor Ely, Mr. Reuben G. Thwaites of Madison, Professor W. Z. Ripley of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Professor Hart also spoke.

The business session, on Saturday afternoon, was unusually well attended, and there was evidence of warm interest in the many important tasks which the Association has entrusted, or proposed to entrust, to its committees. It was reported that there were 1,626 members of the Association, representing a gain of 215 over last

year. The next meeting had, by previous arrangement, been appointed to be held at Washington. The Council reported in favor of meeting in April 1902; but the Association preferred to meet as usual at Christmas-time. It was left to the Committee on the Programme to fix the date more exactly, in conference with the American Economic Association. It can now be announced, with a fair degree of assurance, that the sessions will be held on Saturday, December 28, Monday, December 30 and Tuesday, December 31. The constitution was so amended as to provide for the existence of both a secretary and a corresponding secretary. The Council announced the appointment of Professor Charles H. Haskins of the University of Wisconsin as chairman of the Committee on Programme, and of General A. W. Greeley, U. S. A., of Washington, as chairman of the Local Committee of Arrangements, for the seventeenth annual meeting; and each was given authority to complete his committee at his discretion. It also announced the reelection of Professor George B. Adams of Yale University as a member of the Board of Editors of the *AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, for the term expiring January 1, 1907.

The death of the First Vice-President and the resignation of the Secretary gave especial significance to the election of officers at this meeting. The Second Vice-President, Mr. Charles Francis Adams of Massachusetts, was elected President of the Association; Professor Herbert B. Adams of Baltimore, the retiring secretary, First Vice-President; Captain Alfred T. Mahan, U. S. N., Second Vice-President. Mr. A. Howard Clark, hitherto assistant secretary, was elected Secretary; Professor Haskins Corresponding Secretary. Chief Justice Fuller and Professor Hart retiring from the Council, Professors A. Lawrence Lowell of Harvard and J. Franklin Jameson of Brown University were elected in their places. A full list of the officers of the Association and of the members of its committees, so far as determined at the time of going to press, is given on a later page, at the end of the present article. A minute expressing the Society's appreciation of the long and effective services of Professor Herbert B. Adams as Secretary was adopted by a rising vote. Professor Theodor Mommsen of Berlin was elected an honorary member. It was agreed that delegates should be elected to the International Historical Congress to be held at Rome in 1902. Resolutions expressing the sorrow of the members at the loss of Professor Moses Coit Tyler were adopted by a standing vote. The project of a "Monographic History of America," to be issued under the auspices of the Society, was discussed at some length. It was finally referred back to the Council for further con-

sideration and for discussion at the next annual meeting. For reference in view of this discussion, we subjoin to this article a statement prepared by Professor Hart and sent out by the Council shortly before the Detroit meeting.

The Treasurer, Dr. Clarence W. Bowen, made one of those highly gratifying reports for which he is now looked to annually with perfect confidence. Though the expenditures of the year had been substantially \$5335, he showed assets of \$13,405, an increase of \$824 since last year. Mr. Thwaites reported for the Historical Manuscripts Commission. Professor Charles M. Andrews of Bryn Mawr, chairman of the committee on the Justin Winsor Prize, reported that it was awarded to Mr. W. A. Shaper of Dubuque, hereafter to be a member of the faculty of the University of Minnesota, for an essay on "Sectionalism and Representation in South Carolina." He also reported a code of rules for the award of the prize in future years. They were adopted by the meeting, and are printed on a later page, at the end of the present article. Reports were also made by Professor George B. Adams, for the editorial board of the *REVIEW*, by Professor Edward G. Bourne, chairman of the Committee on Publications, and by Professor William MacDonald of Bowdoin College, chairman of the Public Archives Commission. Resolutions were adopted expressing thanks for the hospitality of those who have been mentioned above as entertaining the Association, and to the two committees who had assured the success of the meeting; and the Association adjourned.

#### PROJECT OF A CO-OPERATIVE HISTORY.

The Committee appointed at Boston to consider a co-operative history of the United States has reported to the Council in favor of the project, and will ask the Council at the Detroit meeting to pass the following proposed vote:

*Voted*, That a standing committee of five be appointed to arrange for the publication of a co-operative history of the United States, under the auspices of the Association, on the following conditions:

1. The Committee to have power to decide on the scope and extent of the work; the publication to be made in small volumes, each complete in itself so far as it goes.

2. The Committee to have power to choose an editor-in-chief, to carry on the work, subject to the determinations of the Committee, which will represent the Association.

3. The Committee to have power to make publishing arrangements.

4. The Association in no case to have any pecuniary responsibility or liability for any expense connected with the history.

5. The Committee to report annually to the Association until the work is finished.

Experienced publishers believe that a work prepared on this plan, under the supervision of the Association, would easily pay for itself. Inasmuch as the plan is a new one, the chairman of the special committee (Professor Albert Bushnell Hart, Cambridge, Massachusetts) will be glad to have the opinions of members of the Association by letter before the Detroit meeting.

#### THE JUSTIN WINSOR PRIZE.

The Justin Winsor prize of \$100, offered by the American Historical Association for the encouragement of historical research, will be awarded for the year 1901 to the best unpublished monograph in the field of American History which shall be submitted to the Committee of Award on or before October 1, 1901.

I. The prize is intended for writers who have not yet published any considerable work or obtained an established reputation.

II. The monograph must be based upon independent and original investigation in American history, by which is meant the history of any of the British colonies in America to 1776, of other portions of the continent which have since been included in the territory of the United States, and of the United States. It may deal with any aspect of that history—social, political, constitutional, religious, economic, military, or biographical, though in the last two instances a treatment exclusively military or biographical would be unfavorably received.

III. The subject matter of the monograph must be of more than personal or local interest and in its conclusions and results must be a distinct contribution to knowledge. In its statements it must attain a high degree of accuracy and in its treatment of the facts collected it must show on the part of the writer powers of original and suggestive interpretation.

IV. The work must conform to the accepted canons of historical research and criticism. It must be presented in what is commonly understood as a scientific manner, and must contain the necessary apparatus of critical bibliography (a mere list of titles will not be deemed sufficient), references to all authorities, and footnotes. In length the work should not be less than 30,000 words or about 100 pages of print. It may be more. If not typewritten, the work must be written legibly upon only one side of the sheet, and must be in form ready for publication. In making the award, the Committee will take into consideration, not only research, accuracy, and originality, but also clearness of expression, logical arrangement, and literary form. The prize will not be awarded unless the work submitted shall be of a high degree of excellence. The successful monograph will be published by the American Historical Association. Address all correspondence to the Chairman of the Committee, Professor Charles M. Andrews, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL  
ASSOCIATION.

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <i>President,</i>   | Charles Francis Adams, Esq.                   |
| <i>First Vice-President,</i>  | Professor Herbert B. Adams.                   |
| <i>Second Vice-President,</i>                                       | Captain Alfred T. Mahan, U. S. N.             |
| <i>Secretary,</i>   | A. Howard Clark, Esq.                         |
| <i>Corresponding Secretary,</i>                                     | Professor Charles H. Haskins.                 |
| <i>Treasurer,</i>   | Clarence W. Bowen, Esq.                       |
| <i>Secretary of the Church History<br/>Section,</i>                 | Rev. Dr. Samuel M. Jackson.                   |
| <i>Executive Council</i> (in addition to the above named officers): |   |
|   | Hon. Andrew D. White, <sup>1</sup>            |
|   | President Charles Kendall Adams, <sup>1</sup> |
|   | President James B. Angell, <sup>1</sup>       |
|   | Henry Adams, Esq., <sup>1</sup>               |
|   | Hon. George F. Hoar, <sup>1</sup>             |
|   | James Schouler, Esq., <sup>1</sup>            |
|   | Professor George P. Fisher, <sup>1</sup>      |
|   | James Ford Rhodes, Esq., <sup>1</sup>         |
|   | Edward Eggleston, Esq., <sup>1</sup>          |
|   | Professor George B. Adams, <sup>2</sup>       |
|   | Professor Andrew C. McLaughlin, <sup>2</sup>  |
|   | Professor William A. Dunning, <sup>2</sup>    |
|   | Hon. Peter White, <sup>2</sup>                |
|   | Professor J. Franklin Jameson, <sup>2</sup>   |
|   | Professor A. Lawrence Lowell. <sup>2</sup>    |

*Committees :*

*Committee on the Programme of the Next Meeting:* Professor Charles H. Haskins, chairman, Professor George B. Adams, Dr. Samuel M. Jackson, Professor William MacDonald, President Lyon G. Tyler, and Professor J. M. Vincent.

*Local Committee of Arrangements:* General A. W. Greeley (with authority to complete the committee).

*Historical Manuscripts Commission:* Professor Edward G. Bourne, chairman, Reuben G. Thwaites, Esq., Professor F. W. Moore, Professor Max Farrand, Dr. T. C. Smith.

*Committee on the Justin Winsor Prize:* Professor C. M. Andrews, chairman, Professor E. P. Cheyney, Miss Elizabeth Kendall, Roger Foster, Esq., Professor E. E. Sparks.

<sup>1</sup> Ex-presidents.

<sup>2</sup> Elected members.



*Committee on Bibliography:* A. Howard Clark, Esq., chairman, Messrs. W. E. Foster, J. N. Larned, George Iles, W. C. Lane, A. P. C. Griffin and E. C. Richardson.

*Committee on Publications:* [Professor E. G. Bourne, chairman,] A. Howard Clark, Esq., Professor F. M. Fling, Rev. Dr. S. M. Jackson, Professor A. D. Morse, Miss Sarah M. Dean, E. F. Henderson, Esq., and Professor Charles Gross.

*Public Archives Commission:* Professor William MacDonald, chairman, Professors L. G. Bugbee and H. W. Caldwell.

*General Committee:* The Corresponding Secretary, chairman, Miss Lucy M. Salmon, Professors G. E. Howard, William MacDonald and J. H. Robinson.